

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In the specification, a paragraph has been amended on pages 43-44.

Claims 1-13 and 16 are requested to be cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 14-15 are currently being amended. Support for the amendments to claims 14-15 can be found at least in the specification on page 38, line 22 to page 39, line 3, and on page 42, lines 9-17.

Claims 17-18 are being added.

These amendments add, change and delete claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 14-15 and 17-18 are now pending in this application.

Specification

The specification was objected to for informalities. The specification has been amended as suggested in the Office Action thus overcoming the objection.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to for incorrect labeling of reference numerals 142 and 143 in Figure 4. Figure 4 has been amended to correct the labeling of reference numerals 142 and 143, thus overcoming the objection.

Claim Rejections –35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,113,248 to Hibi et al. (“Hibi”). Without conceding the propriety of the

above anticipation rejection, claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 have been canceled thus rendering this rejection moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hibi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,729,360 to Kita et al (“Kita”). Without conceding the propriety of the above rejection, claim 5 has been canceled thus rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hibi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,161 to Krabbenhöft (“Krabbenhöft”). Without conceding the propriety of the above rejection, claims 8 and 9 have been canceled thus rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hibi in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0005962 A1 to Iwasaki et al. (“Iwasaki”). Without conceding the propriety of the above rejection, claims 10-13 have been canceled thus rendering this rejection moot.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,118,550 to Hayashi (“Hayashi”) further in view of Iwasaki. Without conceding the propriety of the above rejection, claim 16 has been canceled thus rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hibi in view of Hayashi. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Hibi and Hayashi both fail to disclose or suggest certain features of claim 14, and thus even if combined do not meet all the limitations of that claim. Claim 14, as amended, recite a “linear interpolation means for outputting data used as a black ink signal and interpolating said first data and said second data read from the first lookup table”. Neither Hibi nor Hayashi disclose a “linear interpolation means for outputting data used as a black ink signal and interpolating said first data and said second data read from the first lookup table.”

Moreover, neither Hibi nor Hayashi disclose as recited in claim 14, a “black ink signal selecting means for selecting/outputting either one of said data used as a black ink signal read from the second lookup table or said data used as a black ink signal outputted by said linear interpolation means in accordance with the image attribute signal of the pixel outputted from said identifying means.” Thus, even if combined, Hibi and Hayashi would not meet all the limitations of that claim, and fail to render claim 14 unpatentable.

Hibi and Hayashi both fail to disclose or suggest certain features of claim 15, as amended. Specifically, neither Hibi nor Hayashi disclose a “linear interpolation means for outputting data used as an undercolor signal and interpolating said first data and said second data read from the first lookup table”, nor an “undercolor selecting means for selecting/outputting either one of the data used as an undercolor signal read from the second lookup table and the data used as an undercolor signal outputted by said linear interpolation means as an undercolor signal in accordance with the image attribute signal of the pixel outputted from said identifying means” as recited in claim 15. Thus, even if combined, Hibi and Hayashi would not meet all the limitations of that claim, and fail to render claim 15 unpatentable.

New claims 17 and 18 correspond to claims 14 and 15, respectively, but do not include “means” language. Nevertheless, claims 17 and 18 are patentable for reasons analogous to claims 14 and 15, respectively.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or

even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 8, 2005

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Registration No. 43,438

Attorneys for Applicant

Amendments to the Drawings

The drawing sheet attached in connection with the above-identified application containing Figure 4 is being presented as a sheet to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheet. The drawing Figure 4 has been amended. Appended to this amendment is an annotated copy of the previous drawing sheet which has been marked to show changes presented in the replacement sheet of the drawing.

The specific changes which have been made to Figure 4 are: "MAX" (indicated by reference number 142) is replaced with "MIN" and "MAX" (indicated by reference number 143) is replaced with "SEL".